

"Sobel, Perry OGC" <perry.sobel@navy mi I>

10/17/02 09 39 AM

- To Cynthia Kawakami/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, JohnJ OGrady/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Bradley Benning/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Joseph Dufficy/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, robert darnell@usdoj gov, georgia vlahos@cnet.navy.mil
- cc "Steve Beverly (E-mail)" < beverlysa@efdsouth navfac navy mil>,
 "Anthony Robinson (Efdsouth) (E-mail)"
 <RobinsonAB@efdsouth navfac.navy.mil>, "Taylor, Robert CIV
 (LITOFF)" < Robert Taylor3@navy.mil>

Subject RE R Lavin Property - North Chicago, Illinois

Cynthia/EPA/NAVFAC SouthDiv--

Thanks for forwarding this, Cynthia Do EPA and NAVFAC, SouthDiv agree with the City of North Chicago's representations made to the State in this letter, especially the bottom line conclusion that "there is no impact originating from the R. Lavin site"? When the say "no impact originating from the R. Lavin Site" I'm not sure if they mean "to the environment," in general, or only to off-site groundwater? In other words, do they mean no impact to surface water (i.e., Pettibone Creek)? And is this letter also implying to the State there is no impact from wind-blown or surface runoff releases from soil to groundwater?

Also, are their conclusions about the background wells valid in the CERCLA context? Can you tell me if the point of compliance for RCRA purposes is limited to the vicinity of the regulated unit and was not adjusted to account for possible contribution to an off-Lavin CERCLA site like Pettibone creek? In other words the RCRA program is looking at one groundwater snapshot onsite, but it is possible that higher concentrations have already migrated to surface water and were left by EPA and/or the State to be resolved later as a regional Pettibone Creek issue? If so, then I think the letter is misleading, especially to the City of North Chicago who may think this is a "clean bill of health"

Finally, can someone tell me if, under 40 CFR §264 148 (Incapacity of owners or operators, guarantors, or financial institutions), Lavin actually has a surety or other financial responsibility guarantor for closure and post-closure that is different from the pool of insurance companies that is currently being pursued by the Creditors' Committee's

Thanks -- Perry .

----Original Message----

From Kawakami Cynthia@epamail epa gov
[mailto Kawakami Cynthia@epamail epa gov]
Sent Wednesday, October 16, 2002 5 52 PM
To Ogrady Johnj@epamail epa gov, Benning Bradley@epamail epa gov,
Dufficy Joseph@epamail.epa gov, robert darnell@usdoj gov, Sobel, Perry
OGC, georgia vlahos@cnet navy mil
Subject R Lavin Property - North Chicago, Illinois

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5

Hello everyone, this was sent to me this afternoon by Jeff Jeep

Apparently, the City is still trying to resolve issues with the State,
and, perhaps still redevelop the R. Lavin Site. I'll pass along
information as it arrives. Thanks. Cynthia

----- Forwarded by Cynthia Kawakami/R5/USEPA/US on 10/16/02 04 46 PM

"Jeffery D

Jeep" To "Joseph E Svoboda"

<jdjeep@ameritec <joseph svoboda@epa state il us>

h net> cc Chuck Gunnarson <EPA8823@epa state il us>, Don

Gimbel <donald gimbel@epa state il us>, Robeit Long

PM "Kenneth W Funk" < funk@dlec com>, Cynthia

Please respond Kawakami/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

to jdjeep Subject R Lavin Property - North Chicago, Illinois

Dear Joe,

This follows my email of October 7, 2002

Please find enclosed a letter from Ronald E. Hutchens to Joyce Munie dated November 12, 2001 transmitting groundwater monitoring results for the Lavin property. (The letter is enclosed as an Acrobat Reader file.) A copy of the report was also sent to Howard Chinn at the Office of Attorney General. We assume that you have a complete copy of the report in your files. Please let us know if you would like us to send another copy.

Hutchens concludes "there is no impact [to groundwater] originating from the R. Lavin Site." We also direct your attention to Table 1 of the Environ report, "Groundwater Elevations." The highest elevation for groundwater (16.6 feet) was found at the north end of the Lavin Property. (We enclose Table 1 for your convenience.) The elevation of groundwater goes down at the southern end of the property -- the location of the drainage ditch.

The Environ report is consistent with the measurements of the depth of groundwater taken by Mostardi Platt in March 2001 (which we transmitted to you via electronic mail on October 7, 2002)